

City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes
Tuesday – June 14, 2005 – 7:00 P.M.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

Attendance:

Planning Commission

Angelo Calacino, Chair
Blaine Smith
Dama Barbour
Aimee Newton
Kristie Overson
Phil Hallstrom
Joan Rushton-Carlson
Excused: Ted Jensen

Community Development Staff

Mark McGrath, Director
Michael Maloy, City Planner
Nick Norris, City Planner
Dan Udall, City Planner
Jean Gallegos, Administrative Asst/Recorder

PUBLIC: Mary Lou Binns, Donald Patton, James Bushnell, Gayle Richman, Linda Richman, Stephen Bridgeforth, Ann Riding, Shaun Graham, Rachel Christensen, Richard Perschon, Brandi Olsen, Richard Gee, Devin Olson, Russ Naylor, Aaron Olson, Glen Morse, Chan Tran, Chris Wardle, Bonnie James, Steven Winerton, Doug Barton, Brant Barton, Sharon Roper, Carl Pitt, Bryan Todd, Boyd Martin, Morris K. Pratt, Bill Yadeskie, Susan Yadeskie, Cary Dunn, Shawn Gudgeon.

19:03:17

WELCOME: **Commissioner Calacino** welcomed those present, explained the procedures to be followed this evening and opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA

MINUTES: Review/approval of Minutes for April 26, 2005.

MOTION: By motion of **Commissioner Newton** and **SECOND** by **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** the Consent Agenda was approved.

<u>VOTE:</u>	<u>Commissioner Overson</u>	<u>AYE</u>	<u>Commissioner Hallstrom</u>	<u>AYE</u>
	<u>Commissioner Newton</u>	<u>AYE</u>	<u>Commissioner Barbour</u>	<u>AYE</u>
	<u>Commissioner Smith</u>	<u>AYE</u>	<u>Commissioner Rushton-Carlson</u>	<u>AYE</u>

HOME OCCUPATION

2.	20H05	<u>Rachael Christensen, 6449 S. 4015 W.</u> – Family Day Care. (Nick Norris/City Planner)
----	-------	--

19:07:22

2.1 **Mr. Norris** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. The applicant is requesting a Class D2 Home Occupation Conditional Use Permit to operate a family day care from her home. She indicated that 6-8 children would be attending the day care during the proposed hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. **Staff recommends approval subject to the following conditions:**

2.1.1 That the applicant receives approval and remains compliant with all applicable review agencies.

2.1.2 That the applicant adheres to and remains compliant with Taylorsville Ordinances 13.57.050 Operational Requirements and 13.57.057 Specific Operational Requirements—Class D Home Occupation.

2.1.3 The hours of operation are from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

2.1.4 The outdoor play area be used no earlier than 8:00 a.m.

2.1.5 That no more than 8 children, including the caregiver's own children under age six and not yet in full day school, attend the day care.

2.1.6 The child drop off area be located in the driveway and that a safe means for the children to access the dwelling be provided.

2.1.7 That the day care does not detract from the residential character of the dwelling.

2.1.8 That only a name plate sign, attached to the main building and no larger than three square feet be allowed.

2.1.9 That the conditional use permit is reviewed upon substantiated or unresolved complaint.

2.2 **DISCUSSION**: None.

2.3 **APPLICANT ADDRESS**: Rachael Christensen was present but did not wish to speak unless there were questions..

2.4 **SPEAKING**: None.

2.5 **CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND DISCUSSION OR A MOTION**. [19:08:51](#)

2.6 **MOTION**: [Commissioner Overson](#) - I move for approval of File #20H05 with Staff recommendations.

SECOND: [Commissioner Rushton-Carlson](#)

<u>VOTE</u> :	Commissioner Overson	AYE	Commissioner Hallstrom	AYE
	Commissioner Newton	AYE	Commissioner Barbour	AYE
	Commissioner Smith	AYE	Commissioner Rushton-Carlson	AYE

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS

3. 4G05 **Chan Tran, 1841 & 1863 West 4100 South** - Recommendation to the City Council to Amend the General Plan Map from Low Density Residential to Community Commercial. (Dan Udall/City Planner)

[19:09:41](#)

3.1 **Mr. Udall** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. The applicant is requesting this change in order to eventually build an office building and a commercial building on this site. Both buildings would be one-story and 3,514 square feet. There are presently two single-family homes located on the .89 acre piece of property. **Staff recommends denial of this application because of the following findings:**

3.1.1 That "community commercial" general plan designation is out of character with the adjacent single-family home residential neighborhood located to the west and south.

3.1.2 That commercial buildings would somewhat have an adverse impact on the adjacent residential neighborhood.

3.1.3 That the Planning Commission recommended a general plan designation of "medium density residential" to the City Council in the draft general plan.

3.1.4 That commercial development should be consolidated and more viable or integrated into the community.

3.2 **DISCUSSION**: None.

3.3 **APPLICANT ADDRESS**: **Glen Morse, representing the applicant**. [19:13:28](#) **Mr. Morse** commented that the applicant feels strongly that any kind of residential use would be inappropriate for this site and would like to have approval to build a nice commercial project. Therefore, she is asking for an amendment to consider a General Plan amendment for Community Commercial and Professional Office designation.

3.4 **SPEAKING**: [19:18:35](#) **Jeff (Did not give last name) (Owns the house directly to the west of this site)**. He wanted his property included in the zoning change if the Commission decides to give approval. [19:20:16](#) **Commissioner Calacino** explained that the application tonight is for a General Plan amendment and any subsequent zone change would come later. He suggested to Jeff that he work with Staff and the applicant on his request to include his property.

3.5 **CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND DISCUSSION OR A MOTION:**

- 3.6 **MOTION #1:** 19:21:32 Commissioner Hallstrom - Mr. Chairman, I move to table this application and let the applicant go back and coordinate with Staff and bring it back as soon as they are ready to do so.

SECOND: Commissioner Overson

DISCUSSION: Commissioner Calacino - The motion is to table this application to allow the applicant time to possibly revise their request to something other than Community Commercial.

Commissioner Barbour - Mr. Chair, I believe the applicant deserves a vote on this, up or down and I don't think that would hinder another application. Commissioner Calacino - Mr. McGrath, is there any provision preventing them from making another application? Mr. McGrath - It would prevent them from applying for the same thing but they could apply for a different designation.

Commissioner Barbour - That is why I feel strongly that this particular application deserves a vote, up or down. Commissioner Newton - I agree. I think if their application is for the Community Commercial, that is what we should be considering. If we just table it, I don't want to necessarily lead them on that we are going to consider a different designation. Commissioner Calacino - We have had a motion, second and discussion. I will pose it to Commissioner Hallstrom if he would like to amend his motion, otherwise I will call for the vote.

MOTION #2: Commissioner Hallstrom - I would be happy to amend my motion to allow the Commissioners to either vote it up or down. I will amend the motion to deny the application as now presented. 19:24:54

SECOND: Commissioner Overson

DISCUSSION: Commissioner Calacino - The motion is to make a recommendation to the City Council to deny the General Plan amendment request as proposed based on the findings and facts stated by the Commission.

VOTE:	<u>Commissioner Overson</u>	AYE	<u>Commissioner Hallstrom</u>	AYE
	<u>Commissioner Newton</u>	AYE	<u>Commissioner Barbour</u>	AYE
	<u>Commissioner Smith</u>	AYE	<u>Commissioner Rushton-Carlson</u>	AYE

- | | | | |
|----|------|---|--------|
| 4. | 5G05 | <u>Kevin Olson</u> – Recommendation to the City Council to Amend the General Plan Text in the 4800 South Small Area Master Plan for Property Located at 1130 West 5161 (Dan Udall/City Planner) | South. |
|----|------|---|--------|

Mr. Olson subsequently withdrew this application. However, since it was noticed to surrounding property owners, it was left on the agenda for information purposes.

ZONE CHANGES

- | | | |
|----|------|--|
| 5. | 7Z05 | <u>Brandi Olsen, 3428 West 4850 South</u> – Recommendation to the City Council to Amend the Zoning Map from R-1-8 to R-1-6. (Nick Norris/City Planner) |
|----|------|--|

19:26:19

5.1 Mr. Norris advised that the applicant is proposing to rezone .33 acres of undeveloped land from R-1-8 to R-1-6 in order to subdivide the lot and sell the property. **Staff recommends the Planning Commission give a positive recommendation to the City Council based on the following reasons:**

5.1.1 The request is consistent with the Taylorsville General Plan designation of low density residential.

5.1.2 Rezoning the property does not adversely impact the surrounding neighborhood.

5.1.3 R-1-6 zoning is located within 10 feet of the subject property.

5.1.4 The requested zoning change is in the public interest because the vacant property has annual nuisance problems. Developing the property would eliminate future weed problems.

5.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** Brandi Olsen. 19:28:07 Mrs. Olsen advised that she has a very large lot and would like to build a small house thereon valued at about \$190,000. She felt doing so would clean up the lot and improve property values in the area.

5.3 **SPEAKING:**

1. **Richard Gee**, [19:30:39](#) **Mr. Gee** had concerns that this would be a smaller lot than the others in close proximity, which would increase the density and that it would probably turn out to be a rental unit and lower property values

2. **Katie Santiago**, [19:36:08](#) spoke in favor of this application.

3. **Nan Riding, 4835 S. Simper Lane**, [19:36:46](#) spoke in favor of this application.

5.4 **CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND DISCUSSION OR A MOTION**, [19:37:19](#) **Commissioner Barbour** commented that there were other smaller sized lots in that area. [19:37:42](#) **Commissioner Calacino** said there are R-1-6 sized lots in there. He suggested to the applicant that it might work better if she were to purchase additional property to supplement the square footage of the proposed lot.

MOTION: [19:40:29](#) **Commissioner Newton** – Mr. Chairman, I will make a motion. I move that we give a positive recommendation to the City Council for File #7Z05, including recommendations in the Staff report. I think it fits in with the neighborhood and there will be no fire code issue. I don't believe this will set a precedent because we have R-1-6 already in that neighborhood. I think it would be a good addition.

SECOND: **Commissioner Barbour**

VOTE:	Commissioner Overson	AYE	Commissioner Hallstrom	AYE
	Commissioner Newton	AYE	Commissioner Barbour	AYE
	Commissioner Smith	AYE	Commissioner Rushton-Carlson	AYE

6. 8Z05 **Richard Perschon, 4874 South Plymouth View Drive (1625 West)** - Recommendation to the City Council to Amend the Zoning Map from O-P to R-2-8. (Dan Udall/City Planner)

[19:41:43](#)

6.1 **Mr. Udall** advised that the applicant is requesting this zone change in order to eventually build a duplex on the .32 acre piece of property. On April 20, 2005, the City Council approved a general plan amendment from "Professional Office" to "Medium Density" on the subject property. **Staff is recommending approval of the zone change because of the following findings:**

6.1.1 The R-2-8 zone is compatible with the neighborhood and is a good transition zone between O-P and R-1-8 and C-2 and R-2-8.

6.1.2 The site has the same character with the residential areas to the east and south.

6.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Richard Perschon**, [19:44:33](#) **Mr. Perschon** advised that his reason for doing this was he wanted to do this was so he and his wife could share a twin home with his daughter living on the other side. He asked to be able to keep the garages in the center but would work it out with staff whichever way they wanted it. [19:45:49](#)

6.3 **SPEAKING:** None.

6.4 **CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND DISCUSSION OR A MOTION**.

6.5 **MOTION:** [19:46:00](#) **Commissioner Hallstrom** - Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this is absolutely consistent with the General Plan and there doesn't seem to be any contested issues, with the possible exception of building design reference garage placement, which I am sure Staff can work with the applicant on, I move for approval.

SECOND - Commissioner Newton

DISCUSSION: **Commissioner Calacino** - The motion is to recommend approval of the zone change from O-P to R-2-8 to the City Council based on the findings of fact in the Staff report and it is consistent with the General Plan.

VOTE:	Commissioner Overson	AYE	Commissioner Hallstrom	AYE
	Commissioner Newton	AYE	Commissioner Barbour	AYE
	Commissioner Smith	AYE	Commissioner Rushton-Carlson	AYE

7. 9Z05 **Kevin Olson, 6687 South 1300 West and 1231-1261 West Brewski Bay (6750 South)** - Recommendation to the City Council to Amend the Zoning Map from A-5 and R-1-21 to R-1-6. (Michael Maloy/City Planner)

[19:47:05](#)

7.1 **Mr. Maloy** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. The applicant has requested the above zone change in order to facilitate future subdivision development of three parcels, potentially creating nine new building lots in a planned unit development. **Staff does not support this application based on the following findings of facts:**

7.1.1 **Pending Boundary Adjustment.** Previous to submittal of this application, the applicant petitioned Taylorsville to support a "boundary adjustment" with Murray City, which would allow the property to be annexed into Murray City. This proposal has been warmly supported by both Taylorsville and Murray City. Staff anticipates that the legal process required by the State of Utah for boundary adjustments will begin prior to development of the property. If the boundary adjustment is approved, staff recommends that the citizens and elected officials of Murray City should determine zoning, density and pattern of development for the property and not Taylorsville.

7.1.2 **Adjacent zoning.** Adjacent properties within Taylorsville have lower zoning densities, such as A-5, A-1, R-1-21 and R-1-8. Based on adjacent zoning designations, staff does not support the rezone.

7.1.3 **Sewer Services.** Currently, the properties do not have access to sewer services due to existing site topography. The property slopes down from 1300 West towards the east and is not currently served by Taylorsville-Bennion Improvement District, however, access to Murray sewer services is feasible.

7.1.4 **Poor Conceptual Plan.** Based on a cursory staff review, the proposed subdivision plan has a number of design errors and irregularities. In addition to the above comments, staff believes that the property may be developed if adjacent property owners participate in the process.

7.2 **DISCUSSION:**

7.3 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:**

1. **Kevin Olsen, 5103 S. 1130 W.** Mr. Olsen owns this property along with Jon Brewer. They are trying to work out a solution to the boundary and sewer/water issues. Murray City has been asked to take the project cross boundary if this is approved in Taylorsville. The reason the applicants are asking for R-1-6 is because it is a good transition zone between low and high density. Commissioners questioned why he would want to go through the zoning change in Taylorsville when it may eventually end up under Murray's jurisdiction. **Mr. Olsen** asserted that he wanted to start the process under the jurisdiction of Taylorsville anyway because they has been no time line given by Murray City for a decision on the request.

2. **Aaron Olsen (Cousin of Jon Brewer).** [19:59:28](#) **Mr. Olsen** thanked Staff for all the help they have provided for the proposed boundary adjustment. He said that Mr. Brewer's main concern was to protect his property against encroachment by high density .and that they still wanted to proceed with this application under Taylorsville jurisdiction. Murray City officials have indicated that if the three cities cannot reach a boundary adjustment agreement, they would be willing to take the project as a cross boundary.

7.4 **SPEAKING: Ann Tran** [20:01:38](#). **Ms. Tran** owns property in West Jordan and said she had paid a premium amount in order to have a lot with a view and was concerned about losing that if this development goes in. **Commissioner Calacino** reminded those present that the only issue being decided tonight was the Zoning map amendment. [20:03:48](#)

7.5 **CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND DISCUSSION OR A MOTION.**

7.6 **DISCUSSION:** [20:03:59](#) **Commissioner Newton** asked Mr. McGrath if he had any time-line for the proposed boundary adjustment between the three cities. [20:04:10](#) **Mr. McGrath** replied that all three cities must be in agreement and adopt a resolution, after having conducted the appropriate number of public hearings, so it conceivably could be three or four months out. [20:05:50](#) **Commissioner Barbour** asked if development could proceed until those issues were resolved and **Mr. McGrath** advised that it would be very difficult to do so with no water/sewer available. [20:06:03](#) Taylorsville-Bennion Improvement District and West Jordan City have both indicated they cannot provide that service to this site.

7.7 **MOTION:** [20:11:59](#) **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** - **Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that we table File 9Z05 pending the outcome of either receiving a letter from Murray City agreeing to provide service to that area or an annexation petition that is agreeable between all three of the cities that are involved with that.**
SECOND: [20:12:19](#) **Commissioner Barbour**
DISCUSSION: [20:12:29](#) **Commissioner Calacino** - **We have a motion to table the request for the rezoning of this property pending the outcome of whether or not Murray City provides a letter**

saying they will provide service or whether or not the subject property and those surrounding it get annexed into Murray City and we have an agreement between all three cities. This is open ended and has not been continued to a date certain, so applicant should continue to work with City staff and Murray City to resolve the issues.

VOTE: Commissioner Ovenson NAY Commissioner Hallstrom AYE
Commissioner Newton AYE Commissioner Barbour AYE
Commissioner Smith AYE Commissioner Rushton-Carlson AYE

Commissioner Ovenson explained her opposition was because she felt no action should be taken until Murray City, West Jordan City and Taylorsville make a decision on the annexation. She felt a letter was not as meaningful as the annexation issue.

8.	10Z05	<u>Nathan Coulter</u>	- Recommendation to the City Council to Amend Zoning Conditions on Property Located at 2132-2192 West 5400 South to Allow a Car Wash as Conditional Use. (Nick Norris/City Planner)	a
----	-------	------------------------------	---	---

[20:13:53](#)

8.1 **Mr. Norris** advised that the applicant is proposing to amend the existing zoning conditions in order to construct a car wash with seven wash bays and a fast food restaurant with a drive through on the property. The fast food restaurant was added to the zoning conditions as a conditional use by the City Council on January 13, 2004. In addition to amending the zoning conditions, the applicant is also proposing (Application 11Z05) a zoning text amendment to allow a car wash with up to seven wash bays as a conditional use. The property contains 1.7 acres and there is presently a house located on the southwest corner which will be demolished as part of the proposed development. **Staff recommends the Planning Commission give a positive recommendation for this application to the City Council based on the following reasons:**

1. The request does not adversely impact the intent and purpose of the General Plan.
2. The potential impacts of a car wash on the above property can be mitigated through site design, construction and through the equipment associated with the use.
3. The requested zone change is in the public interest because the vacant property has annual nuisance problems. Developing the property would eliminate future weed nuisances.

8.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS: Dean Ericson, 11707 S. Canberra Drive, Sandy, Utah 84094.** [20:18:33](#) **Mr. Ericson** commented that the City Council has already voted to allow car washes on that site and there is documentation to that effect in the minutes from that meeting. However, that was not how it was written in the ordinance and that is the reason for this hearing tonight to clarify that confusion. **Commissioner Calacino** asked Mr. McGrath if that was correct. [20:19:22](#) **Mr. McGrath** replied that the ordinance that was adopted by the City Council was clearly written to say car wash as an accessory use. The motion that was made was to amend the zoning conditions to allow these three uses but the language of the ordinance that was adopted clearly said car wash as an accessory use. The proposal this evening is for car wash as a primary use.

8.3 **SPEAKING: Gayle Richman** (Owns property bordering on this site) [20:20:44](#) **Mr. Richman** said that he was aware that this parcel will eventually be commercial and asked that a sound wall at least 6' high be included in any proposal. He was very concerned about the drive-through and the impact it would have on his neighborhood. [20:21:22](#) **Commissioner Calacino** commented that there would be an intensive buffer to protect the neighborhood and asked Mr. Richman what type of use he would prefer on that site. **Mr. Richman** advised that he would prefer an office building that would not be open during the evening and weekends.

8.4 **CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND DISCUSSION OR A MOTION.**

8.5 **DISCUSSION** [20:23:16](#) **Commissioner Calacino** indicated that the zoning condition to establish the car wash as a primary use would only apply to this property. [20:24:04](#) When this particular property was zoned C-1, the City had the right to place what they call zoning conditions on a property. That can relate to use, height of building, setbacks and density. In this case, the City Council, when they approved the zoning for this property to C-1, gave a specific list of uses that are allowed on this property. One of them was a car wash, which at the time they specified as an accessory use. The issue tonight is whether it should be primary use or stay as an accessory use.

8.6 **MOTION** [20:28:24](#) **Commissioner Barbour** - **Mr. Chair, I will move that this body sends on the City Council a favorable recommendation on File 10Z05. I don't have an objection to a car wash here. We will deal with the way it looks at a later time.**

SECOND: Commissioner Ovenson

DISCUSSION: [20:29:17 Commissioner Calacino](#) – We have a motion to pass on a positive recommendation to the City Council to amend the Zoning Conditions on this subject property to add a car wash to the list of uses.

VOTE: [Commissioner Overson](#) AYE [Commissioner Hallstrom](#) NAY
[Commissioner Newton](#) AYE [Commissioner Barbour](#) AYE
[Commissioner Smith](#) AYE [Commissioner Rushton-Carlson](#) NAY

ZONING TEXT CHANGE

- | | | |
|----|-------|---|
| 9. | 11Z05 | Nathan Coulter – Recommendation to the City Council to Amend Section 13.26.040 of the Zoning Ordinance to Allow an Automatic Car Wash as a Conditional Use. (Nick Norris/City Planner) |
|----|-------|---|

[20:29:40](#)

9.1 **Mr. Norris** advised that the applicant is proposing to amend the text of Title 13.26.040 to include a car wash with up to seven wash bays as a conditional use. The current text reads: “Automatic automobile car wash not to exceed four (4) wash bays” **Staff recommends the Planning Commission gives a negative recommendation to the City Council for the following reasons:**

1. The proposed text change adds a use that is too intense for a C-1 zoning designation.
2. The proposed text change does not fulfill the purpose of the General Plan designation for Mixed Use Commercial.
3. The proposed text change is not compatible with the purpose of the C-1 zoning designation.

9.2 **DISCUSSION:** **Mr. Norris** explained the difference in a car wash in a C-1 Zone and a C-2 Zone is that in the C-2 Zone it is for an unlimited number of bays. In the C-1 zone, it is limited to four bays. This change, if approved, would apply to C-1 Zoning City-wide. [20:33:05](#)

9.3 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Dean Ericson.** [20:33:45 Mr. Ericson](#) commented that Taylorsville is lacking in the number of car washes compared to other cities. The Environmental Protection Agency is supporting the use of car washes to minimize the use of washing cars in people’s driveways and the subsequent waste of water. He said that car washes, because of high pressure, use 30% less water than home washing systems and with the system they use in their car washes they can claim 20% of the water back for recycle. He felt that the car wash use was very low impact and asked for a positive recommendation to the City Council.

9.4 **SPEAKING:**

1. **Russ Naylor** [20:42:51.](#) **Mr. Naylor** is the architect working on the project design. He was available for any questions the Commission may have tonight.
2. **Nathan Coulter** [20:43:36.](#) **Mr. Coulter** advised that he understood that the hearing this evening was just to address the text amendment but was prepared to show the Commission proposed renderings if anyone desired to see them.

9.5 **DISCUSSION:** [20:44:31 Commissioner Newton](#) asked what surrounding cities have in their ordinance on this subject. [20:44:53 Mr. Norris](#) advised that the problem with comparing our C-1 to other communities is that so many cities have a similar zone but yet it is very different and specific to only their city. The only close comparison would be with Salt Lake County’s ordinance. The intent of our C-1 zone clearly states in the zoning ordinance that it is to provide neighborhood commercial uses. [20:46:13 Commissioner Calacino](#) commented that the design review comes later on and tonight consideration must only be given to the proposed text amendment as to whether or not a certain size of car wash is appropriate for a C-1 zone. Commissioners were apprehensive about the fact that approving this amendment allows for seven bays in any car wash in a C-1 zone anywhere in the City and felt that was too intensive in most cases. [20:48:02](#)

9.5 **CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND DISCUSSION OR A MOTION.**

- 9.6 **MOTION:** [20:49:37 Commissioner Overson](#) - I recommend a negative recommendation be forwarded to the City Council. I believe seven bays is too intense in a C-1 Zone in the City of Taylorsville.
SECOND: [Commissioner Newton](#)
DISCUSSION: [Commissioner Calacino](#) - The motion is to make a recommendation to the City Council to deny the proposal to make a text amendment to the C-1 zone to allow car washes up to

seven bays based on the findings of fact in Staff report and in simple terms that seven bays would be too intense for any C-1 Zone throughout the City. All in favor of that motion say AYE.

VOTE: Commissioner Overson AYE Commissioner Hallstrom AYE
Commissioner Newton AYE Commissioner Barbour AYE
Commissioner Smith AYE Commissioner Rushton-Carlson AYE

Commissioner Barbour asked to go on record saying she did not object to what is being proposed on that site but believed that it should be a different zone than C-1. [20:50:46](#)

CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS

10. 10C05 <u>D.R. Horton, Inc., 4242 South 2200 West</u> - 18 Unit Planned Unit Development. (Final) (Dan Udall/City Planner)

[20:51:21](#)

10.1 **Mr. Udall** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. The applicant plans to construct six buildings with three units in each one. On May 4, 2005, the City Council approved a zone change from A-1 to R-M for the north portion of the property to allow the condominiums to be constructed. The Planning Commission required the applicant to submit the final conditional use application to the Planning Commission. (The issue of the pedestrian gate was discussed at the pre-meeting. [20:53:46](#)

10.1.1 **Staff recommends approval of the final conditional use application with the following findings:**

1. The proposed project with conditions meets the current general plan.
2. The proposed project with conditions meets the R-M zone and the Planned Unit Development ordinances.

10.1.2 **Staff recommends approval of the final conditional use application with the following conditions:**

1. Receive approval from and remain compliant with all applicable reviewing agencies.
2. That site lighting is designed to be oriented from shining upon any adjacent residences. That lighting is provided by a porch light or a small post light in the front of each yard. That lighting fixtures are approved by the City. That a light pole is provided adjacent to 2200 West and the private road.
3. Lighting, walls, colors, building materials, etc., match or compliment the overall design of the project.
4. The site receives storm drain approval from City Engineering and that any storm drain fees are submitted to the City.
5. Any signage must comply with City sign ordinances.
6. That the PUD Homeowner Association maintains the site, including the private road.
7. That a planting plan be provided to staff delineating planting locations and species.
8. That additional trees be planted along the southern perimeter of the site. That deciduous trees be planted along the private road where there is enough space. That shrubs are planted along the landscape strips between each driveway. That a landscape gateway is provided with flowers, shrubs and trees on both sides of the private road adjacent to 2200 West. That a mixture of deciduous and conifer trees are planted along the landscape frontage along 2200 West. That all conifer trees are a minimum height of 6'. That all deciduous trees are a minimum of 2 inch in caliper.
9. Consolidate the open space on the southwest side of the site. Buildings B and C should be moved to the east. That the applicant widens the basketball court.

10. That no parking stalls are allowed in the 25' frontage along 2200 West.
11. That no parking is allowed along the private road.
12. That the building elevations are constructed as approved by the Planning Commission.

13. [Added by Motion] **That there be a pedestrian walkway between this development and existing Watchwood Condominiums.**

10.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** Boyd Martin, Horton Homes 20:54:07. Mr. Martin was present to answer any questions the Commissioner may still have regarding this project. Commissioner Hallstrom addressed the issue that the Commission specifically asked for a pedestrian walk way into Watchwood to accommodate the school children. 20:54:28. However, no such access is shown for a separate pedestrian walkway and the crash gate cannot be used for that purpose. Mr. Martin advised it was his understanding that Watchwood did not want the kids cutting through their project to and from school. Commissioner Smith 20:55:40 said that he remembered the lady representing Watchwood at the last meeting said they had no problem with establishing a separate pedestrian gate there. Commissioner Overson 20:56:06 felt the confusion is when the Commissioner made the motion at the preliminary hearing, the wording in the motion said also that there be means provided for pedestrian access through there if in fact there is a gate. The issue is that was made part of the motion but in the list of conditions proposed this evening, that is not one of them and the pedestrian walkway needs to be added this evening to maintain consistency with the recommendation given at the preliminary stage 20:57:03 Commissioner Hallstrom 20:58:02 agreed, adding that the safety of the children is the most important issue.

10.4 **SPEAKING:** No one came forward.

10.5 **CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND DISCUSSION OR A MOTION.**

10.6 **MOTION 21:01:37 Commissioner Hallstrom** – I make a motion for approval of this application for final approval and commend the applicants for a job well done, however, the approval must be subject to a pedestrian walkway which was agreed to by the Watchwood people when they were here at the last meeting on this subject. If they now wish to change the approval they gave us previously, they need to notify the Staff, in which case the Commission will either approve or disapprove. We want to be clear on the fact that we were told that would be okay

SECOND: Commissioner Overson

DISCUSSION: 21:02:27 Commissioner Calacino – The Planning Commission is recommending approval of this project based on the one added condition that there be a pedestrian walkway between this development and existing Watchwood Condominiums. Commissioner Barbour - 21:02:51 One other point, which is if the developers go in there and leave the opening in order to complete the project in accordance with our conditions and Watchwood subsequently decides they don't want that on their private property and boards it up, what have we accomplished? Commissioner Newton – The motion takes that into consideration because if Watchwood really doesn't want that, then they can work it out with Staff. Commissioner Hallstrom - I don't know the solution but I don't think we should ignore it. I think that if they made a public commitment and the lady so doing represented herself as an executive from Watchwood, then they should be accountable for their commitment. We have to stand good to our agreements and they made an agreement with us. 21:03:50. I think it is a misunderstanding and when it comes down to it and they see what is going on, either they will scream bloody murder and come back to the staff or be agreeable to having said that.

<u>VOTE:</u>	<u>Commissioner Overson</u>	AYE	<u>Commissioner Hallstrom</u>	AYE
	<u>Commissioner Newton</u>	AYE	<u>Commissioner Barbour</u>	AYE
	<u>Commissioner Smith</u>	AYE	<u>Commissioner Rushton-Carlson</u>	AYE

11. 17C05 <u>Wendy Anderson, 5647 South Bennion Drive (3160 West)</u> - Animal Hobby Permit. (Nick Norris/City Planner)

21:04:27

11.1 **Mr. Norris** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. The applicant has requested permission to license a total of five adult cats (three more than what is normally permitted) at a single-family residence. The property is located in an R-1-8 single family residential zone. The parcel contains approximately 9,360 square feet. The application was initiated due to a complaint received by Salt Lake County Animal Services, who responded to a complaint from a neighbor about multiple cats and cats roaming the neighborhood. Animal Services personnel did not see any cats outside the immediate vicinity of the home but the applicant did admit to

having five cats. Staff observed one cat leaving the property and entering another property but there was no proof that cat was one of the five residing at the subject property.

11.1.1. **Findings of Facts:** Taylorsville Ordinance 13.50.090 states: The planning commission shall not authorize a conditional use permit unless the evidence presented is such as to establish:

1. The proposed use at the particular location is necessary or desirable to provide a service or facility which will contribute to the general well-being of the neighborhood and the community; and
2. Such use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity; and
3. The proposed use will comply with the regulations and conditions specified in this title for such use; and
4. The proposed use will conform to the intent of the city general plan.

11.1.2 **Staff Recommendation:** **Staff recommends approval, pending any public comment against the application, with the following conditions:**

1. Receive approval from and remain compliant with all requirements of applicable reviewing agencies (i.e., Salt Lake County Animal Services, Salt Lake Valley Health Department, etc.).
2. Applicant shall comply with all requirements of the animal hobby permit as stated within the City of Taylorsville Code of Ordinances, Title 8, Animals.
3. The cats shall not be permitted to roam freely at any time and must be under the owner's restraint when outside.
4. Conditional use permit is subject to review upon substantiated and unresolved complaint. Complaints which cannot be resolved by City staff or Salt Lake County Animal Services personnel may be grounds for permit revocation.
5. That medical records for the animals be provided prior to a permit being issued to insure that the animals have been properly cared for.
6. Such pets are individually licensed.
7. Such pets are rendered sterile.
8. Approval is granted by the Health Department and the Director of animal Services.
9. Adequate areas for confinement and shelter are provided for; and
10. All applicable provisions of the Taylorsville Code of Ordinances are complied with and no pet or premises is deemed to be a nuisance.

11.2 **DISCUSSION:** **Mr. Norris** advised that he has received some comments from neighbors. Both were generic in nature and complaints were about too many cats running wild in the neighborhood, not these specific cats.

11.3 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Wendy Anderson**. [21:07:19](#) **Ms. Anderson** advised that she has tried to find homes for the extra cats but was unsuccessful and has since formed an emotional attachment to them. She advised that two of them have rabies shots and if given the permit she will assure the rest receive their shots. [21:14:40](#)

11.4 **SPEAKING:** None.

11.5 **CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND DISCUSSION OR A MOTION.**

11.6 **MOTION:** **Commissioner Hallstrom** - I move for approval of File #17C05 in accordance with Staff recommendations, including "review upon complaint".
SECOND: **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson**

VOTE: [Commissioner Overson](#) NAY [Commissioner Hallstrom](#) AYE
 [Commissioner Newton](#) AYE [Commissioner Barbour](#) AYE
 [Commissioner Smith](#) AYE [Commissioner Rushton-Carlson](#) AYE
[Commissioner Overson](#) explained that her NAY vote was based on the fact that she felt five cats was too many.

12. 19C05 <u>Cricket Communications, 2750 West 5200 South</u> – Extension of Cell Tower to 80” High. (Preliminary) (Nick Norris/City Planner)
--

[21:16:28](#)

12.1 **Mr. Norris** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. The applicant is requesting preliminary approval of a conditional use amendment to extend an existing telecommunications tower from 60 feet to 80 feet in height. The tower is located on a property owned by Utah Power and contains an electrical substation and two communication towers. The tower will be co-located by two cell phone providers.

12.1.1. **Findings of Facts:** Taylorsville Ordinance 13.50.090 states: The planning commission shall not authorize a conditional use permit unless the evidence presented is such as to establish:

1. The proposed use at the particular location is necessary or desirable to provide a service or facility which will contribute to the general well-being of the neighborhood and the community; and
2. Such use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity; and
3. The proposed use will comply with the regulations and conditions specified in this title for such use; and
4. The proposed use will conform to the intent of the city general plan.

12.1.2 **Staff recommends preliminary approval with the following conditions:**

1. The communication tower be compliant with Ordinance 13.40.280 Monopole.
2. The tower be co-located with another cell provider.
3. The maximum height of the tower be 80 feet.
4. The applicant submitted a three year plan that includes the proposed number of poles projected within the City limits.
5. The pole be painted a color that will reduce the visual impact on the adjacent residential areas.
6. The applicant complies with all Taylorsville Building Department requirements.
7. The applicant adheres to and remains compliant with all regulations of applicable agencies.

12.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Shawn Gudgeon**. [21:19:35](#) The 60’ tall pole is ineffective and the applicant is proposing to relocate from the T-Mobile pole to the Sprint pole at the 80’ high location for better coverage. **Commissioner Hallstrom** wanted the applicant to know that he was very concerned about something unknown killing the trees along the access road closest to the towers [21:21:27](#). **Mr. Gudgeon** said it could not have anything to do with the cell towers because the phones only put out 1/4th of a watt of power and no health issue has been proven at that low level. **Commissioner Hallstrom** said he still wanted to find out what is causing the trees to die. [21:24:10](#).

12.3 **SPEAKING:** None.

12.4 **CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND DISCUSSION OR A MOTION.** Commissioners felt Commissioner Hallstrom had a valid concern about the trees dieing but did not feel this applicant could be held accountable for that. **Commissioner Newton** advised that the Commission is bound by law to find a location for cell phone towers, so there is little choice. [21:28:52](#) **Mr. McGrath** commented on the correlation between the damaged trees and the towers saying that he felt there was a connection between the two. [21:29:21](#) The intent of the trees is to disguise the compound there. As those trees die, it would be legitimate to require they are replaced. This use is intensifying what is going on in the compound. **Commissioner Calacino** [21:30:43](#) suggested that if there was an

approved plan that showed the landscaping and specific trees and when amendments come in and during investigation of the proposal, the site is found to be not in compliance because a tree or landscaping dies, the Commission has the right to require the site be brought into compliance. Part of that would be to replace what is gone.

- 12.5 **MOTION: 21:32:44 Commissioner Barbour - I move that this body approves Application #19C05 with Staff's recommendation.**
SECOND: Commissioner Overson
DISCUSSION: Commissioner Calacino - The motion is to approve the proposal to extend the existing cell tower from 60' to 80' per Staff's findings and recommendations.
VOTE: Commissioner Overson AYE Commissioner Hallstrom NAY
Commissioner Newton AYE Commissioner Barbour AYE
Commissioner Smith AYE Commissioner Rushton-Carlson AYE
Commissioner Hallstrom advised that the reason for his NAY vote was he felt the Commission was rushing to conclude an issue that deserves a little bit more study. 21:33:39

13. 20C05 Amsource, 5345 South 4015 West - Athletic Gymnasium (Preliminary) (Nick Norris/City Planner)

21:33:48

13.1 **Mr. Norris** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. The applicant is requesting preliminary approval of a conditional use permit for a commercial Planned Unit Development (PUD) on a five acre parcel. The property contains the former Food-4-Less structure, which is currently vacant. The applicant is proposing to convert the structure into a Gold's Gym. The structure will remain in place and a small addition will be constructed to the east side of it. Fuel bays will be removed. The applicant is proposing to make some exterior alterations.

13.1.1. **Findings of Facts:** Taylorsville Ordinance 13.50.090 states: The Planning Commission shall not authorize a conditional use permit unless the evidence presented is such as to establish:

1. The proposed use at the particular location is necessary or desirable to provide a service or facility which will contribute to the general well-being of the neighborhood and the community; and
2. Such use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity; and
3. The proposed use will comply with the regulations and conditions specified in this title for such use; and
4. The proposed use will conform to the intent of the Taylorsville City General Plan.

13.1.2 **Staff recommends preliminary approval with the following conditions:**

1. The applicant will plant two trees, equally spaced, per parking row throughout the parking lot. The species chosen will have a canopy of 15-20 feet at maturity and roots that have a tendency to grow down instead of out, reducing the chances of the roots damaging any curbing or asphalt area.

2. The applicant will also install four trees along both sides of the main entrance.
3. The end caps of each parking row will be planted with two trees per end cap and shrubs.
4. Four trees, equally spaced, will be planted along 4015 West.
5. A bike rack will be installed near the front entrance.
6. Potted planters will be added to the front of the building.
7. The applicant obtains a building permit for all work that requires a permit and adheres to all Building Department requirements.
8. All exterior lighting that is to be placed on the building be shielded in such a manner as to reduce the impact to the residential neighborhood.
9. The City Engineer approves any changes, if needed, to be existing storm drainage system.

10. All signage is installed as shown on the submitted elevations. Any changes to the signage as shown on the elevations are approved by Staff unless there are any issues that cannot be resolved between the applicant and staff, in which case the issue shall be resolved by the Planning Commission.

11. If any issue arises that cannot be resolved by the applicant and staff, the issue shall be resolved by the Planning Commission.

12. Staff grants final approval.

13.2 **DISCUSSION:** Commissioners expressed that inasmuch as this is a commercial planned unit development, it can be held to a little higher standard and one of their major concerns was access. **Mr. Norris** added that this application has the capability of vastly improving a site in the City that is an eyesore and seems to be an appropriate use for this parcel.

13.3 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Brian Todd, Amsource**. [21:44:46](#) **Mr. Todd** advised that this will be a dramatic improvement for this site and will look like the Gold's Gym location in South Jordan. He said there is not a huge profit margin in doing a gym so they have to be watchful of site improvements. Commissioners were in favor of the architecture of the proposed structure but were concerned about the sparse landscaping proposed and asked that to be upgraded. **Commissioner Calacino** [21:52:09](#) suggested that every area of striping in the parking lot could be landscaped instead and asked that all four sides of the building be addressed in the architecture. He also suggested removing one of the two access points to the west. [21:54:06](#).

13.4 **SPEAKING:**

13.5 **CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND DISCUSSION OR A MOTION.**

13.6 **MOTION:** [21:55:11](#) **Commissioner Newton** - I move for approval of Application #20C05 with preliminary approval with Staff recommendations and also for them to look at more landscaping in shaded areas and the ends of parking stalls, etc. The Commission would like more information about the other three sides of the building to be addressed with the Commission later. I am not sure about closing access on the west side and will let the applicant include that if they want to but not include it in the motion. The recommendations reference that Staff grants final approval. **Commissioner Barbour** - I would like to see this again. **Commissioner Newton** - Okay, we will remove Staff recommendation #12. **Mr. Todd** asked that Staff be allowed to do the final approval in the interest of time, because the owners will not do this without a promised January 1, 2006 opening target date. **Commissioner Newton** - I am fine with Staff doing the final review because I know they know how strongly we feel about the landscaping issue, so I will leave #12 in. [21:56:22](#) **Commissioner Overson** - I think we are covered under Item #11 that if there are any problems that we can resolve them, although I am confident that staff has heard what we said, as well as the applicant, and this can be resolved satisfactorily. **Commissioner Newton** - On parking ratios, what are you looking for on that? **Commissioner Calacino** - It should be no more than five per thousand. **Mr. Norris** - They currently have 5.38 per thousand. [21:58:37](#) **Commissioner Newton** - I am confident that if they can get the landscaping figured out, it will all take care of itself and I am fine with that.

SECOND: **Commissioner Barbour**

DISCUSSION: [21:58:52](#) - **Commissioner Calacino** - We have a motion to grant preliminary approval of this proposed project based on Staff's findings and recommendations and added conditions outlined that the applicant addresses all four sides of the building and that they look at adding more landscaping in the areas they currently show as just striped in the parking lot and at the ends of the parking rows. All in favor of that motion please signify by AYE.

VOTE:	Commissioner Overson	AYE	Commissioner Hallstrom	AYE
	Commissioner Newton	AYE	Commissioner Barbour	AYE
	Commissioner Smith	AYE	Commissioner Rushton-Carlson	AYE

14. 21C05 **Cary Dunn (Nova Source), 5419 South Redwood Road** - Commercial Planned Unit Development (Conceptual). (Michael Maloy/City Planner)

[21:59:23](#)

14.1 **Mr. Maloy** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. **Mr. Dunn**, representing Nova Source Development, has applied for conceptual approval of a proposal to remodel the former Dos Serranos Restaurant into a new 8,500 square foot mixed-use commercial building. The conceptual plan proposes two restaurant tenant

spaces and two retail locations. The .93 acre parcel is located within a C-2 Commercial Zone. **Staff makes no recommendation for approval or denial at conceptual review.**

14.2 **DISCUSSION:** **Commissioner Overson** wondered if the large monument signs included in the Redwood Road project would impact this site. She also wanted to know the status of the two bus stops at that intersection. **Mr. Maloy** said the question on the monument sign would be better answered by the applicant because he has been working closely with those in charge of the project. **Mr. Maloy** did say the bus stops would be relocated to the north side of 5400 South and would include turn outs

14.3 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Cary Dunn**. [22:14:19](#) **Commissioner Newton** asked what types of shops or restaurants would be included in this project and **Mr. Dunn** said it would be a well known Mexican restaurant but could give no further details regarding tenants because it is still in negotiation. [22:20:07](#) **Commissioner Calacino** suggested locating some extra parking spaces against the building and **Mr. Dunn** said that was less efficient and they would lose too many spaces. He advised that they are tied to certain numbers with their agreement with Wal-Mart and as it stands now, they have more parking space for this use than did the previous occupant of the building. [22:21:36](#) **Commissioner Calacino** expressed concern with the square footage of the building being able to accommodate a variety of usage and the impact of outdoor seating. He said there needs to be flexibility but creativity in the numbers.

14.4 **SPEAKING:** None.

14.5 **CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING.** No motion required.

15. 22C05 <u>Christopher Wardle, 6118 West 4800 South</u> - 1,000 Square Foot Detached Garage (Preliminary) (Nick Norris/City Planner)
--

[22:25:57](#)

15.1 **Mr. Norris** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. The applicant is requesting preliminary approval to construct a detached 1,040 square foot garage in his rear yard. The property is approximately 11,655 square feet and is located in an R-1-6 zone.

15.1.1. **Findings of Facts:** Taylorsville Ordinance 13.50.090 states: The planning commission shall not authorize a conditional use permit unless the evidence presented is such as to establish:

1. The proposed use at the particular location is necessary or desirable to provide a service or facility which will contribute to the general well-being of the neighborhood and the community; and
2. Such use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity; and
3. The proposed use will comply with the regulations and conditions specified in this title for such use; and
4. The proposed use will conform to the intent of the city general plan.

15.1.2 **Staff recommends preliminary approval with the following conditions:**

1. The accessory structure be compliant with Ordinance 13.45.2050, including all setback requirements, coverage restrictions, height requirements, etc.
2. The structure shall not be used in conjunction with a commercial business of any kind. Repair of personal vehicles will be allowed within the structure.
3. Appropriate storm drainage measures be installed to prevent storm drainage from running onto neighboring properties.
4. The structure be constructed in compliance with all requirements of the Taylorsville Building Department.
5. The applicant adheres to and remains compliant with all regulations of applicable agencies.
6. The conditional use permit is revocable upon substantiated complaint or if any of the conditions placed on the conditional use permit are not adhered to.

15.2 **DISCUSSION:** [22:27:52](#) **Commissioner Hallstrom** asked about the height of the proposed structure and if the garage would end up being larger than the house. **Mr. Norris** said it was limited to 16' measured at mid-point and the garage was smaller than the house. **Commissioner Overson** asked that since the back yard has a definite slope, where then is the roof height measured from. [22:29:36](#) **Mr. Norris** said that is would be measured from the lowest grade perimeter.

15.3 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Christopher Wardle.** [22:31:29](#) **Mr. Wardle** said that the garage tucks into a flat point of the slope and will be under 1,040 square feet in size, depending on the tier in the corner. He said the home is 2,000 square foot and the garage will not be highly visible.

15.4 **SPEAKING:**

1. **Billy Essex** [22:32:56](#) His main concern was what the use of the garage would be because this is a small, very quiet residential area and he would like to keep it that way. They did not want any type of commercial use allowed within this structure. Mr. Wardle works on cars during his spare time and that was a real concern of the neighbors. **Mr. Wardle** [22:35:28](#) advised that this would not be used for commercial use. He just wants the structure built to house personal items inside.

2. **Mary Lou Binns.** [22:37:59.](#) She was concerned over the size of the structure.

15.5 **CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND DISCUSSION OR A MOTION.**

15.6 **MOTION:** [22:39:22](#) **Commissioner Hallstrom** - Mr. Chairman, I was concerned that this was too large of a structure, however, they have made some effort to mitigate that and that it wasn't as large in comparison with the home as we thought. I think if we have secondary structures suddenly becoming larger in mass than the primary structure then there is a problem. However, that does not seem to be the case here. Also, it sounds like the slope will help mitigate the problem. Therefore, I would move for approval of this application as submitted and in accordance with Staff recommendations.

SECOND: **Commissioner Barbour.**

VOTE:	Commissioner Overson	AYE	Commissioner Hallstrom	AYE
	Commissioner Newton	AYE	Commissioner Barbour	AYE
	Commissioner Smith	AYE	Commissioner Rushton-Carlson	AYE

16	23C05	Don Patton, 677 West 4800 South - 40 Attached Units (Conceptual) (Dan Udall/City Planner)
----	-------	--

[22:40:22](#)

16.1 **Mr. Udall** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. This property was recently master planned as high density residential and rezoned from A-1 to R-M by the City Council. The applicant has submitted a conceptual plan of the proposed development. The applicant has proposed a private road to access the units and the project is adjacent to the Jordan River. The units are proposed to be one-story and two-stories and the property contains 9.06 acres. Staff makes no recommendation for approval or denial at conceptual review.

1. Commissioners expressed continued concern that a major portion of this site is located in the flood plain and wanted to make sure that written approval is received from each department concerned, i.e., Army Corps of Engineers, State Department of Natural Resources, Department of Water Quality, Salt Lake County Flood Control, FEMA and all agencies involved in storm water control, the meander corridor, the 100' flood plain and 100' buffer.

16.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Don Patton.** [22:50:40](#) **Mr. Patton** advised they have done their homework and have letters showing wetlands designation. [23:04:42](#) **Commissioner Hallstrom** said that 70% of the ground is involved in the flood plain so the plan apparently just will not work. He asked for a specific map that shows all that. **Mr. Patton** said he would obtain that information. **Commissioner Barbour** asked him his feelings about the 100' setback from the river requirement and **Commissioner Overson** asked about the Wetlands Trail. **Mr. Patton** said they intend to comply with all City ordinances and will move the entrance further to the west as suggested by **Commissioner Calacino**, however, there is no requirement by the City for a trail in this area. [23:10:02](#) **Commissioner Calacino** suggested for consideration adding larger back yards and common areas and added he was not in favor of making this a gated community due to the problems associated with access for this project.

16.4 **SPEAKING:** None.

16.5 **CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING** - **No Motion Required.**

MEETING REVIEW - Review of City Council Meeting. [23:14:58](#) **Commissioner Newton** gave her summary of the discussion regarding establishing a post office in Taylorsville and planning matters, including the rezone on Winchester Road.

ADJOURNMENT: By motion of **Commissioner Overson** the meeting was adjourned at [23:27:02](#).

Respectfully submitted by:

Jean Gallegos, Administrative Assistant to the
Planning Commission

Approved in meeting held on July 12, 2005.